

Neutrinos at high energy accelerators¹

Probir Roy

Tata Institute Of Fundamental Research

e-mail: probir@tifrvax.bitnet

- PREAMBLE
- BRIEF HISTORY AND PRELIMINARIES
- QUICK REVIEW OF BASIC NEUTRINO PROPERTIES
- CHARGED CURRENT NEUTRINO PROCESSES
- NEUTRAL CURRENT NEUTRINO PROCESSES
- VERY HEAVY NEUTRINOS
- CONCLUDING SUMMARY

¹Lectures given at the 11th Mt. Sorak Symposium (July 20-25, 1992), Sok-cho, Korea

• PREAMBLE

Why is neutrino physics interesting today? I can list four reasons. First, our neutrino detectors actually disprove a claim made by the inventor of the neutrino more than sixty years ago. In his 1930 letter to the participants at the Radioactivity Conference in Tübingen, Pauli had proposed an undetectable neutral particle. Second, neutrinos – either as beams or as final state products – constitute clean and accurate probes into leptonic and semileptonic weak processes since they appear to have no interactions other than the weak one. Third, neutrinos provide a window to catch a glimpse of various types of possible new physics beyond the Standard Model – seesaw mechanisms, new generations, left-right symmetries, grand unified theories etc. Finally, the study of primary cosmic neutrinos, i.e. neutrino astronomy, is beginning to unravel mysteries of various astrophysical objects.

A major part of neutrino physics is concerned with relatively low-energy neutrinos or antineutrinos. These can come from astronomical sources such as the sun, a supernova, etc. Alternatively, they can be produced from weakly decaying terrestrial sources that are at rest or moving slowly. In these lectures we shall not cover those aspects. Rather, our focus will be on ultra-GeV neutrinos. Such neutrinos can and do get produced by cosmic ray interactions in the earth's atmosphere but their fluxes are low except below 1 GeV or so. So we shall confine ourselves to ultra-GeV neutrinos produced at high energy accelerators from the decays of fast-moving mesons. There are many machines where good quality beams of such neutrinos have been used or are available. Quite rich physics has emerged out of scattering experiments with such beams. We shall review the essentials of this physics and show in a selective way how some of these have become cornerstones of the Standard Model today. Additionally, we shall try to go a little bit beyond the SM and speculate on the existence of new very heavy neutrinos ($\gtrsim$ tens of GeV in mass) and discuss possible production mechanisms and search strategies for them.

• BRIEF HISTORY AND PRELIMINARIES

Till the beginning of the sixties most neutrinos, studied directly or indirectly in laboratories, were products from nuclear β -decay ($Z \mp 1, A$) $\rightarrow$

$(Z, A) e^\mp \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e \\ \nu_e \end{pmatrix}$ or from muon decay $\mu^\mp \rightarrow e^\mp \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu \\ \nu_e \bar{\nu}_\mu \end{pmatrix}$. An important example was the Cowan-Reines experiment [1] which used electron antineutrinos from β -decaying neutron-rich fragments produced from the fission of ^{235}U in a reactor to study the reaction $\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow n + e^+$.

In modern times ultra-GeV neutrino beams are generated in proton (or antiproton) accelerators when the primary beam hits a target producing copious numbers of pions and kaons decaying as $\pi \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mu \bar{\nu}_\mu \\ \bar{\mu} \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix}$ or $K \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mu \bar{\nu}_\mu \\ \bar{\mu} \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix}$. Thus these are largely muon neutrinos or antineutrinos. A separation can be made between the two by sweeping out the positively and negatively charged mesons in different directions. An illustrative sketch of how a secondary neutrino beam is obtained is shown in Fig. 1.

For a primary proton beam, the positives among the forward going mesons outnumber the negatives. In fact, at Fermilab, the ratio $n(\pi^+) : n(\pi^-)$ among such hadrons is typically $\sim 10 : 1$. This means that such machines yield more intense ν_μ beams than $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ ones. Fig. 2 shows [2] how $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ beams at various accelerators have become progressively more intense from 1960 to 1990. It is also possible to have an electron neutrino or antineutrino beam by exploiting K_{e3} decay $K \rightarrow \pi \begin{pmatrix} e \bar{\nu}_e \\ \bar{e} \nu_e \end{pmatrix}$, but this is a harder process.

The deduction of the energy spectrum of a secondary beam of neutrinos or antineutrinos is a complicated and tricky procedure. It consists basically of two major steps : (1) careful monitoring of the momenta of the charged pions and kaons produced and their two body leptonic decay modes (indeed, depending on whether the permitted range of π/K momenta is wide or narrow, one would get a wideband or narrowband neutrino beam) and (2) direct measurement of the charged current induced quasielastic processes $\nu_\mu n \rightarrow \mu^- p$, $\bar{\nu}_\mu p \rightarrow \mu^+ n$ from a nuclear target. Typical examples of $\nu, \bar{\nu}$ spectra, obtained in the early days of Fermilab, are shown in a theoretically idealized form in Fig. 3. Though the Monte-Carlo derivation of the neutrino spectrum has become a reliable technique these days, some uncertainties do persist and contribute systematic errors to absolute cross section measurements. These are, however, absent from flux-independent ratios of cross sections.

One of the first spectacular experiments with O(GeV) muon neutrinos was done by Lederman et al who concluded, from the failure to observe the reaction $\nu_\mu n \rightarrow ep$, that $\nu_\mu \neq \nu_e$. Since cross sections for such quasi-elastic processes are small, in the early seventies experimentalists started studying deep inelastic scattering processes

$$(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N \rightarrow \mu^\pm X$$

with very large targets (e.g. huge heavy liquid bubble chambers such as GARGAMELLE). These yielded sizable rates and eventually led to the discovery of neutral current induced processes

$$(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N \rightarrow (\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)X.$$

Since then there have been many subsequent efforts directed towards the study of these two types of processes. In fact, it is fair to say that these provide the reference frame for neutrino physics at high energy accelerators these days. (Of course, purely leptonic scattering processes, e.g. $\nu_\mu e \rightarrow \nu_\mu e, \mu\nu_e$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu e, \bar{\mu}\nu_e$ and more exotic reactions such as $(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N \rightarrow (\text{dimuons})X$ have also been studied). Based on them, finer studies have been made on the excitation of heavy flavours, Quantum Chromodynamics tests, searches for electroweak physics beyond the Standard Model, etc. These experiments have always been done with large ($> 10^3$ cubic metres) and heavy ($> 10^2$ tons) detectors. After the extinction of bubble chambers, these detectors have largely been hadron calorimeters laced with layers of counters. A list of some of the recent and current detectors is given in Table 1. (N.B. this is not a comprehensive list).

Name	Collaboration	Accelerator	Description	Status
CDHS	CERN–Dortmund– Heidelberg–Saclay	SPS,CERN	Magnetized iron toroids in- strumented with scintillator strips and drift chambers	Finished
CHARM 1	CERN–Hamburg– Amsterdam–Rome– Moscow	SPS,CERN	Marble plates interspersed with scintillation counters and drift tubes	Finished
US/JAP	United States–Japan $\nu_\mu e, \bar{\nu}_\mu e$ expt.	BNL	170 ton detector with liquid scintillators and proportional drift tubes	Finished
FMMF	Fermilab–MIT– Michigan–Florida State	TEVATRON	200 ton calorimeter finegrained with flash cham- bers and proportional tubes	Finished
CCFR	Columbia–Chicago– Fermilab–Rochester	TEVATRON	~ 700 ton hadron calorimeter of steel plates interlaced with spark chambers and liquid scintillators; for neutrino and antineutrino scattering from nucleons only	Running
CHARM II	CERN–Hamburg– Amsterdam–Rome– Moscow	SPS,CERN	~ 690 ton detector of thick glass plates with scintilla- tion counters and streamer tubes; can study neutrino and antineutrino scattering from both electrons and nucleons	Running

Table 1. Some recent and current neutrino detectors

• QUICK REVIEW OF BASIC NEUTRINO PROPERTIES

Neutrinos in the SM

In the SM the left-chiral neutrino $\nu_{\ell L}$ ($\ell = e, \mu, \tau$) appears in the same flavour doublet as its charged counterpart ℓ_L^- . However, while the right-chiral ℓ_R^- does make an entry as a flavour singlet, $\nu_{\ell R}$ does not. Thus the neutrino ν_{ℓ} cannot have a Dirac mass owing to the latter's absence. On the other hand, any Majorana mass term for it would be lepton number violating and the SM has lepton conservation built into it. Thus the three neutrinos ν_e, ν_{μ} and ν_{τ} are massless in this model. The experimental upper limits on their Dirac masses are 7.3 eV, 0.27 MeV and 35 MeV respectively [3]. Only in scenarios going beyond the SM, e.g. left-right symmetric or grand unified theories [4], do the right-chiral components $\nu_{eR}, \nu_{\mu R}$ and $\nu_{\tau R}$ occur.

Unlike other fermions of the SM, the neutrinos here have only gauge interactions and no Yukawa couplings. The interaction terms in the Lagrangian for the charged current (CC) and neutral current (NC) vertices can be written respectively as

$$\mathcal{L}_I^{CC} = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\ell} \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{\ell} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_{\ell} W_{\mu}^{-} + h.c. \right] \quad (1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_I^{NC} = -\frac{g}{2 \cos \theta_W} \sum_{\ell} \frac{1}{2} \bar{\nu}_{\ell} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_{\ell} Z_{\mu}. \quad (2)$$

Here the semiweak coupling g and the positron charge e are related through the Weinberg angle θ_W by $g = e/\sin \theta_W$, while g is given in terms of the Fermi constant $G_F = 1.166365(16) \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ via $g^2/(8M_W^2) = G_F/\sqrt{2}$. Furthermore, $x_W \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$. It is noteworthy that in the SM all neutrino currents have the $V - A$ form. Moreover, on account of the masslessness of the neutrinos, there is no mixing among them.

Illustrations of CC and NC phenomena

The leptonic decay of the W -boson is the simplest charged current process involving the tree-level vertex (1). One has the partial width

$$\Gamma(W^{-} \rightarrow \ell^{-} \bar{\nu}_{\ell}) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{M_W^3}{6\pi} \simeq 214 \text{ MeV}. \quad (3a)$$

The total leptonic width of the W is

$$\Gamma_W^{\text{lep.}} \equiv \sum_{\ell} \Gamma(W^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_{\ell}) \simeq 642 \text{ MeV}. \quad (3b)$$

Similarly, the invisible decay mode of the Z into a specific neutrino-antineutrino channel is the archetypal neutral current process – employing the vertex (2):

$$\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \nu_{\ell} \bar{\nu}_{\ell}) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{M_Z^3}{12\pi} \simeq 155 \text{ MeV}. \quad (4a)$$

Consequently, the total invisible Z -width is

$$\Gamma_Z^{\text{Inv.}} \equiv \sum_{\ell} \Gamma(Z \rightarrow \nu_{\ell} \bar{\nu}_{\ell}) \simeq 465 \text{ MeV}. \quad (4b)$$

Defining $\Gamma_Z^{\text{Inv.}} \equiv N_{\nu} \Gamma(Z \rightarrow \nu_{\ell} \bar{\nu}_{\ell})$, one finds [4] from the LEP 1 data that $N_{\nu} = 2.99 \pm 0.04$. Of course, one could have one or more generations [5] with neutrinos that have masses $> \frac{1}{2}M_Z$ which are not accessible in Z -decay.

• CHARGED CURRENT NEUTRINO PROCESS

Mu-neutrino electron scattering

The reaction $\nu_{\mu} e^- \rightarrow \mu^- \nu_e$ the simplest four-fermion CC scattering process. We shall follow the convention of ascribing the four-momentum $p(f)$ to the fermion f and write the four-momentum transfer to the target as q . Define

$$s \equiv [p(\nu_{\mu}) + p(e)]^2, \quad t \equiv q^2 \equiv -Q^2 = [p(\nu_{\mu}) - p(\mu)]^2,$$

so that in the physical region $0 < Q^2 < s$. We also introduce the inelasticity variable

$$y \equiv p(e) \cdot [p(\nu_{\mu}) - p(\mu)] / p(e) \cdot p(\mu) = [(E_{\text{initial}} - E_{\text{final}}) / E_{\text{initial}}]_{\text{lab}}$$

lying in the kinematic range $0 < y < 1$. It is also convenient to introduce the W -propagator function (we ignore the W -width)

$$R_W(Q) \equiv \frac{M_W^4}{(M_W^2 + Q^2)^2}$$

which is nearly unity when $Q^2 \ll M_W^2$.

For CM energies much larger than the electron mass ($s \gg m_e^2$), the lowest order differential cross section is given by

$$\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu e}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{\pi} R_W(Q). \quad (5)$$

The lack of y -dependence in the RHS of (5) is a hallmark of the left-chiral $V - A$ interaction of the W . In contrast, a right-chiral $V + A$ interaction would have yielded an extra $(1 - y)^2$ factor. In fact, by comparing (5) with experiment, an upper limit $|g_R/g_L| < 0.0039$ has been obtained [6] on the ratio of the magnitudes of a right-chiral and a left-chiral semiweak coupling. In the largely available kinematic range $m_e^2 \ll Q^2$, $s \ll M_W^2$, (5) can be integrated to yield the total cross section formula

$$\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu e} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{\pi}. \quad (6)$$

The linear rise of the total cross section with s in the relevant kinematic range is experimentally well-established and the value of the coefficient has been verified at the 5% level [6].

Mu-neutrino isoscalar nucleon deep inelastic CC scattering

The reactions $(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N \rightarrow \mu^\mp X$ are studied using a heavy approximately isoscalar nuclear target and an external muon identifier. As before

$$0 < Q^2 \equiv -[p(\nu_\mu) - p(\mu)]^2 < s \equiv [p(\nu_\mu) + p(N)]^2$$

and

$$0 < y \equiv \frac{p(N) \cdot [p(\nu_\mu) - p(\mu)]}{p(N) \cdot p(\nu_\mu)} = [(E_{\text{initial}} - E_{\text{final}})/E_{\text{initial}}]_{\text{lab}} < 1.$$

The deep inelastic region corresponds to s, Q^2 being $\gg M_N^2$ with Q^2/s fixed. Formally, this is reached by the limit $Q^2 \rightarrow \infty$ with $Q^2/2p(N) \cdot [p(\nu_\mu) - p(\mu)] \equiv \omega$ fixed.

In this scaling limit (ω being the scaling variable) the asymptotic freedom property of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) allows a parton model description [7]. According to this, the deep inelastic scattering cross section can be described (Fig. 6) as an incoherent sum of elementary scattering processes of the neutrino from quark and antiquark partons folded by the parton distribution function $\int dx q_i(x, Q^2)$ for the i^{th} type of parton. Here x is the longitudinal fraction of the nucleon momentum carried by the parton in an infinite momentum frame. This variable x is constrained to equal ω through a $\delta(x - \omega)$ which arises as a factor in the elementary cross section and kills

the x -integration. The relevant elementary processes of ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ scattering from quarks and antiquarks are shown in Fig. 7.

Let u, d refer to the up, down type of quark and $i(= 1, 2, 3)$ to the generation. The quark and antiquark distribution functions are reasonably well-

known [8] from QCD studies. Isospin invariance implies

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_i(x, Q^2) \\ di(x, Q^2) \end{bmatrix}_p = \begin{bmatrix} di(x, Q^2) \\ u_i(x, Q^2) \end{bmatrix}_n$$

and similarly for antiquarks, with $p(n)$ referring to a target proton (neutron). Utilizing these relations, one can write all quark distributions $q_i(x, Q^2)$ and antiquark distributions $\bar{q}_i(x, Q^2)$ with respect to a proton only.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(Q^2) &\equiv \sum_i \int_0^1 dx q_i(x, Q^2), \\ \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2) &\equiv \sum_i \int_0^1 dx \bar{q}_i(x, Q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and also consider notionally an isoscalar nucleon $N \equiv \frac{1}{2}(p+n)$ as the target. Now the QCD Parton Model expressions for the differential cross sections of our proceses (ignoring inter-generation transitions) can be written as

$$\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} R_W(Q^2) \left[\mathcal{Q}(Q^2) + (1-y)^2 \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2) \right], \quad (8a)$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} R_W(Q^2) \left[\mathcal{Q}(Q^2)(1-y)^2 + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2) \right]. \quad (8b)$$

For the large kinematic range $M_N^2 \ll s$, $|t| \ll M_W^2$, (8) integrates to the total cross section formulae

$$\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{6\pi} \left[3\langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle + \langle \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle \right], \quad (9a)$$

$$\sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{6\pi} \left[\langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle + 3\langle \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle \right], \quad (9b)$$

where angular brackets have been put on $\mathcal{Q}, \overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ since a Q^2 -averaging takes place along with the y -intergration. Once again, the linear s -dependence is well-tested [9].

Neutrinos from ep scattering

Electron neutrinos and antineutrinos can be produced through the CC processes

$$\begin{aligned} e^- p &\rightarrow \nu_e X, \\ e^+ p &\rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e X, \end{aligned}$$

as will be studied shortly in HERA which has 820 GeV protons colliding with 30 GeV e^- or e^+ . The corresponding differential cross sections are

$$\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{e^-p \rightarrow \nu_e X}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} R_W(Q) \left[\mathcal{U}(Q^2) + \overline{\mathcal{D}}(Q^2)(1-y)^2 \right], \quad (10a)$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{e^+p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e X}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} R_W(Q) \left[\mathcal{D}(Q^2)(1-y)^2 + \overline{\mathcal{U}}(Q^2) \right]. \quad (10b)$$

In (10)

$$\mathcal{U}(Q^2) = \sum_i \int_0^1 dx u_i(x, Q^2), \quad (11a)$$

$$\mathcal{D}(Q^2) = \sum_i \int_0^1 dx d_i(x, Q^2), \quad (11b)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{U}}(Q^2) = \sum_i \int_0^1 dx \bar{u}_i(x, Q^2), \quad (11c)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{D}}(Q^2) = \sum_i \int_0^1 dx \bar{d}_i(x, Q^2). \quad (11d)$$

Integrated cross sections ~ 50 pb are expected [10].

One can also have muon neutrinos and antineutrinos produced, along with charged dileptons, through the reactions

$$e^\pm p \longrightarrow \begin{matrix} e^+ \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu X \\ e^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu X \end{matrix}.$$

The corresponding Feynman diagrams are given below. Integrated cross

sections $\sim 5 \times 10^{-2}$ pb are expected [10] at HERA.

- NEUTRAL CURRENT NEUTRINO PROCESSES

Mu-neutrino electron scattering

The elastic scattering reaction $(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)e \rightarrow (\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)e$ is one of the sim-

plest NC -induced four fermion processes.

One can define s, t and Q^2 in analogy with the $\nu_\mu e \rightarrow \mu^- \nu_e$ case and take the inelasticity variable to be

$$y \equiv q \cdot p(e) [p_{\text{initial}}(\nu_\mu) \cdot p(e)]^{-1} = [(E_{\text{initial}} - E_{\text{final}})/E_{\text{initial}}]_{\text{lab}}$$

Furthermore, in the zero-width approximation, the Z propagator function is

$$R_Z(Q) = \frac{M_Z^4}{(Q^2 + M_Z^2)^2}.$$

We shall also find it convenient to write x_W for the sine squared of the Weinberg angle $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$.

The lowest order differential cross sections can now be written, in the limit when $s \gg m_e^2$, as

$$\frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu e}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{\pi} R_Z(Q) [g_L^2 + g_R^2(1-y)^2], \quad (12a)$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu e}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{\pi} R_Z(Q) [g_{Le}^2(1-y)^2 + g_{Re}^2], \quad (12b)$$

with

$$g_{Le} = -\frac{1}{2} + x_W, \quad (13a)$$

$$g_{Re} = x_W. \quad (13b)$$

Here g_{Le} and g_{Re} respectively define the left-chiral and right-chiral $Ze\bar{e}$ couplings. In (12a), the latter contribution has a $(1-y)^2$ coefficient, but not the former. One can compare this situation with the corresponding charged current case. For the scattering of the $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ off an electron, the role of the $(1-y)^2$ factor gets reversed; it now multiplies the left-chiral rather than the right-chiral contribution.

As in the CC case, for $m_e^2 \ll Q^2, s \ll M_Z^2$, (12) can be integrated to yield total cross sections

$$\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu e} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{4\pi} \left(1 - x_W + \frac{16}{3} x_W^2 \right) \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-2} (E_{\text{initial}}/10 \text{ GeV}) fb,$$

$$\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu e} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{4\pi} \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{4}{3} x_W + \frac{16}{3} x_W^2 \right) \simeq 1.3 \times 10^{-2} (E_{\text{initial}}/10 \text{ GeV}) fb.$$

An important ratio from which x_W and hence θ_W – the mixing angle between $SU(2)_L$ and $U(1)_Y$ – can be directly determined is

$$\frac{\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu e}}{\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu e}} = \frac{1 - 4x_W + \frac{16}{3} x_W^2}{\frac{1}{3} - \frac{4}{3} x_W + \frac{16}{3} x_W^2}. \quad (14)$$

In extracting x_W from ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ elastic scattering from the same target of atomic electrons, one has to carefully monitor the relative fluxes of the $\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu$ beam components. Of course, many systematic errors cancel out in the ratio. Finally, complete 1-loop radiative corrections have to be accounted for; fortunately, this has now been done. Employing all these steps the CHARM II experiment [11] has determined

$$x_W = 0.233 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.008, \quad (15)$$

where the second error is statistical and the third is the estimated systematic error.

Mu-neutrino isoscalar nucleon deep inelastic NC scattering

We employ the same notation as in the corresponding CC induced deep inelastic neutrino scattering. Thus we can write NC differential cross sections analogous to (8) as

$$d\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu N}/dy = (2\pi)^{-1} G_F^2 s R_Z(Q) \left[(g_{Lu}^2 + g_{Ld}^2) \{ \mathcal{Q}(Q^2) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2)(1-y)^2 \} \right. \\ \left. + (g_{Ru}^2 + g_{Rd}^2) \{ (1-y)^2 \mathcal{Q}(Q^2) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2) \} \right], \quad (16a)$$

$$d\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}/dy = (2\pi)^{-1} G_F^2 s R_Z(Q) \left[(g_{Lu}^2 + g_{Ld}^2) \{ (1-y)^2 \mathcal{Q}(Q^2) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2) \} \right. \\ \left. + (g_{Ru}^2 + g_{Rd}^2) \{ \mathcal{Q}(Q^2) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2)(1-y)^2 \} \right] \quad (16b)$$

and

$$g_{Lu}^2 + g_{Ld}^2 = \frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{5}{9} x_W^2, \quad (17a)$$

$$g_{Ru}^2 + g_{Rd}^2 = \frac{5}{9}x_W^2. \quad (17b)$$

We have defined g_{Lq} and g_{Rq} ($q = u, d$) in analogy with g_{Le} and g_{Re} . For the neutrino case, the expression multiplying the left-chiral couplings has $(1-y)^2$, 1 as the coefficient of the antiquark, quark distribution while that multiplying the right-chiral couplings has 1, $(1-y)^2$ as the coefficient of the antiquark, quark distribution. The situation is exactly reversed for the antineutrino case. Once again, for $M_N^2 \ll Q^2$, $s \ll M_Z^2$, (16) can be trivially integrated to give total cross sections

$$\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu N} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{20}{27}x_W^2 \right) \langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{20}{9}x_W^2 \right) \langle \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle \right\}, \quad (18a)$$

$$\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N} = \frac{G_F^2 s}{2\pi} \left\{ \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{20}{9}x_W^2 \right) \langle \mathcal{Q} \rangle + \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{20}{27}x_W^2 \right) \langle \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle \right\}. \quad (18b)$$

The relations (16) are very useful – especially with respect to extracting x_W and hence θ_W . First, note a useful equality due to Llewellyn Smith [12]:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N}}{dy} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{5}{9}x_W^2 \right) \frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{(\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)N}}{dy} + \frac{5}{9}x_W^4 \frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{(\bar{\nu}_\mu, \nu_\mu)N}}{dy}. \quad (19)$$

The advantage of (19) is that it does not involve the quark and antiquark distributions in a nucleon. The disadvantage is that the relative fluxes of the ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ beams need to be calculated accurately. In fact, many ratios, called Paschos-Wolfenstein [13] ratios, are independent of quark and anti-quark distributions since $\{\mathcal{Q}(Q^2) \pm \overline{\mathcal{Q}}(Q^2)\} \{1 \pm (1-y)^2\}$ can be factored out by taking the sum or difference of (16a) and (16b). Thus

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu N}}{dy} + \frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}}{dy} \right) \left(\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N}}{dy} + \frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}}{dy} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{10}{9}x_W^2 \quad (20a)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu N}}{dy} - \frac{d\sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}}{dy} \right) \left(\frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N}}{dy} - \frac{d\sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}}{dy} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} - x_W. \quad (20b)$$

If we define $R_\nu \equiv \sigma_{NC}^{\nu_\mu N} / \sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N}$, $R_{\bar{\nu}} \equiv \sigma_{NC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N} / \sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N}$ and $r \equiv \sigma_{CC}^{\bar{\nu}_\mu N} / \sigma_{CC}^{\nu_\mu N}$, R_ν and $R_{\bar{\nu}}$ become flux-independent quantities while r is sensitive to the

knowledge of the relative fluxes of the ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ beams. (18) can now be recast as

$$R_\nu = \frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{5}{9}x_W^2(1+r), \quad (21a)$$

$$R_{\bar{\nu}} = \frac{1}{2} - x_W + \frac{5}{9}x_W^2\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right), \quad (21b)$$

This relation (22) is totally flux-independent and provides a clean means of extracting x_W . Using such relations, the CHARM group determined [14]

$$x_W = 0.233 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.005.$$

• PROPERTIES OF VERY HEAVY NEUTRINOS

Preliminaries

A massive neutrino (generically described by a field N) can be one of two types : Dirac or Majorana, depending on whether it is different from its antiparticle or identical to it. The antiparticle is described by the charge-conjugated field N^C . A Dirac neutrino field ($N \neq N^C$) has four distinct chiral components : $N_L, N_R, N_L^C = N_R^C, N_R^C = N_L^C$. It has a mass term in the Lagrangian given by

$$\mathcal{L}_m^D = -M_N^D(\bar{N}_L N_R + \bar{N}_R N_L). \quad (22)$$

A Majorana neutrino, in contrast, has $N = N^C$ and hence only two distinct chiral components : $N_L = N_L^C = N_R^C$ and $N_R = N_R^C = N_L^C$. Though it can be described by a 2-component formalism, we will find it convenient to use the same formalism as in the Dirac case with the proviso $N = N^C$. The Majorana mass term in the Lagrangian, which violates lepton number, can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_m^M = -\frac{1}{2}M_N^M \bar{N}^C N + h.c. = -\frac{1}{2}M_N^M N^T C^{-1} N + h.c., \quad (23)$$

where C is the charge conjugation matrix with

$$N^C = (\bar{N}C)^T, \\ \gamma^0 C^* \gamma^0 = C^{-1}.$$

We shall consider very heavy neutrinos [15] with mass $\gtrsim$ tens of GeV that can be wither Dirac or Majorana type.

Theoretical motivation

There exist a number of scenarios in which such very heavy neutrinos are expected to occur. We outline a few.

1. *Fourth generation model* – This has been proposed by Hill and Paschos [5] and has a heavy charged lepton ℓ and a neutrino N making a fourth replica of the existing three generations. Thus one has a left-chiral doublet and two right-chiral singlets

$$\begin{pmatrix} N \\ \ell^- \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad \ell_R^-, \quad N_R.$$

Existing LEP constraints from Z -decay simply require that $M_N > \frac{1}{2}M_Z$. One need not have N_R but then would be forced to invoke the lepton-number violating Majorana mass term (23).

2. *Left-right symmetric model* – The simplest such model employs the gauge group $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ and contains one left-chiral and one right-chiral lepton doublet per generation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad \begin{pmatrix} N \\ e \end{pmatrix}_R.$$

(We have distinguished here between ν and N since we are leading up to two physically different neutrinos per generation: one very light and one very heavy). One can have a seesaw mass term (with $M \gg m$)

$$\mathcal{L}_m = -\frac{1}{2}m\bar{\nu}_L N_R - \frac{1}{2}M N_R^T C^{-1} N_R + h.c. = -\frac{1}{2}(\bar{\nu}_L \bar{N}_R^C) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m \\ m & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^C \\ N_R \end{pmatrix} + h.c. \quad (24)$$

The eigenvalues of the seesaw mass-matrix, $\simeq M$ and $\frac{m^2}{M}$ (the negative sign of the latter being absorbed by a chirality transformation $\psi \rightarrow \gamma_5 \psi$) describe a very heavy and a very light physical neutrino. References to discussions of their phenomenology can be found in [16].

The very heavy neutrino, described in the above two scenarios, can be searched for in LEP 200 via the reaction $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow N\bar{N}$ provided its mass is less than a 100 GeV. It can, in principle, be looked for by exploiting its mixing with ν_e via the production mode $ep \rightarrow NX$ at HERA but the estimated cross sections [16] look impossibly small. However, there are two other scenarios as discussed below.

3. *Pure singlet model* – In this case there is an extra right-chiral singlet heavy neutrino N_R for each generation. Thus, for the first, one has

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, C_R, N_R.$$

N_R can have a large Majorana mass and it is possible to arrange a seesaw mass-matrix between ν_L and N_R . The main importance of this type of a model is that [17] N can be produced singly in e^+e^- or ep collision, as detailed later.

4. *E_6 -based models* – The grand unifying gauge group E_6 is very popular among model builders starting with the $E_8 \times E_8$ superstring. The matter fields in an E_6 GUT, arising from the topological breakdown of one of the E_8 's, belong to the **27** dimensional representation of E_6 . This can accommodate three extra heavy neutrinos [8], their masses depending on various symmetry-breaking scales in the breakdown chain $E_6 \rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. Two of these neutrinos are $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ singlets. The third, transforming as part of a vectorial doublet with respect to weak isospin, directly couples to W and Z . The others too can mix with the usual very light neutrinos ($\nu_\ell, \ell = e, \mu, \tau$) and develop couplings to the weak bosons.

Heavy neutrino couplings and decays

There are far too many model-independent possibilities in the pattern of couplings of such very heavy neutrinos to the known elementary particles. We try to adopt a generic approach following [17]. Let us assume that, on account of mixing with ν_ℓ , N develops a charged current coupling to $W\ell$ and

neutral current couplings to NZ as well as $\nu_\ell Z$ – as shown below. Here

ξ is a small seesaw mixing factor (hopefully $\gtrsim 10^{-3}$) and $V_{N\ell}$ is a Kobayashi-Maskawa type matrix element. (It may be noted that the model of [5] cannot be covered by this since there is no $ZN\bar{\nu}_\ell$ vertex there and no mixing factor in the $ZN\bar{N}$ coupling). We are also obliged to choose $M_N > M_Z$, otherwise – for $\xi > 10^{-3}$ – the decays $Z \rightarrow M\bar{\nu}_\ell, \bar{N}\nu_\ell$ would have already been seen at LEP.

We come to the decays of N . First, consider the case when N is a Dirac particle. Now, for the charged current mode

$$\Gamma(N \rightarrow \ell^+ W^+) = \Gamma(\bar{N} \rightarrow \ell^+ W^-) = \frac{|\xi V_{N\ell}|^2}{8\sqrt{2}\pi} \frac{G_F}{M_N^3} (M_N^2 + 2M_W^2)(M_N^2 - M_W^2)^2. \quad (25)$$

Contrariwise, for the neutral current mode

$$\Gamma(N \rightarrow \nu_\ell Z) = \Gamma(\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\ell Z) = \frac{|\xi|^2}{8\sqrt{2}\pi} \frac{G_F}{M_N^3} (M_N^2 + 2M_Z^2)(M_N^2 - M_Z^2)^2. \quad (26)$$

The equality of the N and $\bar{N}$ partial widths in (25) and (26) follows from CP -invariance. The charged current mode is less dominant than the neutral current one since the latter does not have the small $|V_{N\ell}|^2$ factor. For a Majorana heavy neutrino, N and its antiparticle are identical and one simply has $\Gamma(N \rightarrow \ell^- W^+) = \Gamma(N \rightarrow \ell^+ W^-)$ and $\Gamma(N \rightarrow \nu_\ell Z) = \Gamma(N \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\ell Z)$, with

the corresponding expressions still given by (25) and (26) respectively. Thus the lifetime of N gets halved as compared with a Dirac N . In either case, for $M_N \gg M_{W,Z}$ and $\xi \gtrsim 10^{-3}$, the mean free path is $\ll$ cms. Thus, if produced in the laboratory, such an N will decay within the detector.

Though the neutral current induced decay is the dominant mode, the charged current mediated one ($N \rightarrow \ell W$) can provide the cleanest signals for detection. The W can decay into two jets so that $\ell(2j)$ is the detectable final state configuration. For the Dirac case and with a pair-produced $N\bar{N}$, one would have the hard signal $\ell^+\ell'^-(4j)$ where ℓ and ℓ' need not be the same. (Of course, one would have to tackle the severe background from the semileptonic decays of top-antitop pairs). If a pair of Majorana N 's gets produced, we can have three possibilities : $\ell^+\ell'^-(4j)$, $\ell^+\ell^+(4j)$ and $\ell^-\ell^-(4j)$. While these are characteristic signals, one cannot exclude a very heavy neutrino in the relevant mass-range simply by failing to observe them. This is because certain models allow [8] the dominant decay $N \rightarrow \nu J$ where J is a very light pseudo-Goldstone boson like a Majoron. The experimental unobservability of this decay channel would make it harder to discover N .

Production mechanisms

First, we take up the production of single N 's. In an e^+e^- collider this can be done through the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow N\bar{\nu}_\ell, \bar{N}\nu_\ell$. These go via the Feynman diagrams of Fig. 13. Asymptotically, for a large CM energy $\sqrt{s}$, the cross section is approximately $\pi^{-1}G_F^2M_W^2|V_{\ell N}\xi|^2$. Note that for a Majorana N there are only three diagrams since (c) and (d) become one and the same. In any event, the Z -mediated part contributes only about 2% of the total cross section. This it is a good approximation to take only the W -mediated part. Typically, a fraction of a picobarn is expected at LEP 200 as shown in Fig. 14.

In Fig. 14 the production cross section [17] has been plotted against $\sqrt{s}$ as well as against the heavy neutrino mass M_N . Coming to electroproduction $e^-p \rightarrow NX$, say at HERA, the cross section is shown against M_N for various values of $\sqrt{s}$. Of course, the signal (Fig. 15) will depend on whether the N decays into ℓW or $\nu_\ell Z$, but $\ell^-(2j)\cancel{E}_T$, $\ell^+\ell^-\cancel{E}_T$, and $\ell^+\ell'^-\cancel{E}_T$ are possible signal configurations. It has recently been suggested [18] that the process $e^-\gamma \rightarrow W^-N$ (Fig. 16) would be a viable production mechanism in a 1 TeV e^+e^- linear collider with a cross section $\sim |\xi V_{N\ell}|^2$ pb.

Next, we come to pair-production. This can be attained through the $ZN\bar{N}$ coupling which is perhaps less model-dependent than the $ZN\bar{\nu}$ one. We put a generic mixing factor χ to cover the cases where N is an $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ singlet. (For a regular fourth generation heavy neutrino, χ is unity). The cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow N\bar{N}$ (Fig. 17) can be calculated [8] to be

$$\sigma = \frac{G_F^2 s}{24\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4M_N^2}{s}\right)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{M_N^2}{s}\right) R_Z(Q) |\chi|^2 (1 - 4x_W + 8x_W^2). \quad (27)$$

In the high-energy limit when $s \gg M_Z^2$, the RHS of (27) goes as $2.5 \times 10^{-2} |\chi|^2$ (pb/s in TeV^2) which is about $0.6 |\chi|^2$ pb for $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV at LEP 200. Similar considerations hold for the Drell-Yan type of production process $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow N\bar{N}$ in a hadron collider. One problem with the cross section of (27) is the rapid fall off of the factor $R_Z(Q)$ at large s which drastically reduces the cross section at supercollider energies $\gtrsim 1$ TeV.

We shall discuss an alternative mechanism of heavy neutrino pair-production via the fusion of two gluons [19] which is relevant to pp supercolliders. As shown in Fig. 18, two gluons from the colliding protons can go via a quark loop into an off-shell Z boson which converts into an $N\bar{N}$ pair. The heavy neutrinos, in turn, decay into $\ell(2j)$ and $\ell'(2j)$, say so that the signal configuration is $\ell\ell'(4j)$. For a Majorana pair, one can have like sign dileptons which with four jets make an almost unique signal for this process. In the case of a Dirac pair and a signal configuration of

$\ell^+\ell'^-(4j)$, the background from $t\bar{t}$ pair-production and subsequent semileptonic decays of $t, \bar{t}$ would be overwhelming. But now one can hook on to the leptonic decay of one of the W 's and search for the signal $\ell^+\ell'^-\ell''^+(2j)\cancel{E}_T$ or $\ell^+\ell'^-\ell''^-(2j)\cancel{E}_T$. There are several characteristic features of this mechanism:

- The triangular loop has a nonzero contribution only from the axial part of the Z -coupling, the vector part vanishing on account of Furry's theorem.
- The contributing part is an anomaly graph proportional, not only to the third component of the weak isospin of the fermion circulating in the

triangle, but also – through the divergence of the axial current – to its mass. Thus the mass difference $|M_U - M_D|$ between the up-type and down-type quarks of the heaviest generation comes in the numerator of the dominant part of the amplitude.

- By Yang's theorem, the amplitude is nonzero only because of the off-shell nature of the Z . The consequent $Q^2 - M_Z^2$ in the numerator cancels the denominator from the propagator making the cross section only weakly dependent on s .

It turns out that, with the three known generations of quarks, the cross section from the above mechanism will not be measurable at supercollider energies. However, if there is a fourth generation of quarks with $|m_U - m_D| \sim 100$ GeV, then one can get quite decent cross sections (fb to tens of fb) both at SSC and LHC. Fig. 19 shows these cross sections as a function of M_N both for $\sqrt{s} = 16$ TeV (LHC) and $\sqrt{s} = 40$ TeV (SSC). The bands are generated by variations in m_V (from 400 GeV to 1200 GeV) with $|m_V - m_D|$ kept ~ 100 GeV.

It has recently [20] been realized that the Higgs-mediated $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow N\bar{N}$ cross section is enhanced relative to the Z -mediated one to which it adds incoherently on-account of the difference in the s -channel angular momentum. One can actually have both scalar Higgs H and pseudoscalar Higgs P exchanges (in models with more than one doublet) which also add incoherently. Choudhury et al have, in fact, demonstrated (taking $m_{\text{top}} = 160$ GeV) that the cross section at SSC energies in either case is expected to be quite large (pb to sub-pb range) even with just the three known generations of quarks. This is displayed in Figs. 20 below.

• CONCLUDING REMARKS

In covering the salient features of accelerator-based neutrino physics, we hope to have brought forth in a reasonably persuasive way that the subject is alive and well. Right now two major high energy neutrino beam experiments are in progress, being undertaken by the CCFR and CHARM (2) groups. The level of precision in the data (with respect to both statistics and systematics) continues to become more impressive day by day. Those aspects of the Standard Model which are probed by high energy neutrino beams are very well tested. It is also possible to perform neutrino oscillation experiments with accelerator-generated neutrino beams. Indeed, such experiments have been designed at Fermilab and CERN. But I have chosen to leave those topics to speakers focusing on neutrino oscillations.

Apart from scattering experiments with neutrino beams, final state neutrinos have been and are being produced and studied. LEP 1 has made a major contribution in this direction. HERA as well as LEP 200 and the forthcoming pp supercolliders LHC and SSC do and will provide opportunities to search for new very heavy neutrinos ($\sim 10^2$ GeV in mass). The best bet seems to be Higgs-mediated pair-production in pp supercolliders.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Jihn E. Kim for inviting me to lecture in this delightful summer school and also for giving me the opportunity to see Korea. I thank K.V.L. Sarma for several helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Reines and C.L. Cowan, Phys. Rev. **113** (1957) 273.
- [2] C.H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Rep. **3C** (1972) no. 5.
- [3] Review of Particle Properties, Phys. Rev. **D45**, Part 2 (June 1992).
- [4] A. Gurtu, Proc. X DAE Symp. *High Energy Physics*, Pramana J. Phys. (suppl.), in press.
- [5] C.T. Hill and E. Paschos, Phys. Lett. **B241** (1990) 96.
- [6] S.R. Mishra, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **19** (1991) 193.
- [7] R. Feynman, *Photon-Hadron Interactions* (Benjamin, 1972). P. Roy, *Theory of Lepton-Hadron Processes at High Energies* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975). F. Close, *Introduction to Quarks and Partons* (Academic Press, London, 1979).
- [8] V. Barger and R.J.N. Phillips, *Collider Physics* (Addison-Wesley, corrected edition, 1988).
- [9] S.R. Mishra and F. Sciulli, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **39** (1989) 259.
- [10] M.M.J.F. Janssen, Nationaal Instituut voor Kernfysica en Hoge-Energiefysica Report NIKHEP-H/91-07.
- [11] D. Geiregat et al., Phys. Lett. **232B** (1989) 539.
- [12] C.H. Llewellyn Smith, Nucl. Phys. **B228** (1983) 205.
- [13] E. Paschos and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 91.
- [14] P.G. Reutens et al., Phys. Lett. **152B** (1985) 404.
- [15] M. Gronau, C.N. Leung and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. **D29** (1984) 2539. H.E. Haler and M.R. Reno, Phys. Rev. **D31** (1986) 2372.
- [16] G. Altarelli, B. Mele and R. Ruckl, CERN-ECFA Workshop **2** (1984) 549 (QCD 183:E2:1984).

- [17] W. Buchmüller and C. Greub, Phys. Lett. **B256** (1991) 465; Nucl. Phys. **B381** (1992) 109.
- [18] M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, O.J. Éboli, F. Halzen and S.F. Novaes, Phys. Lett. **B280** (1992) 313.
- [19] D.A. Dicus and P. Roy, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 1593.
- [20] A. Datta and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Lett. **B278** (1992) 162; D. Choudhury, R.M. Godbole and P. Roy, Phys. Lett. **B308** (1993) 394.